DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 194 EC 302 921

TITLE	State Incentive Grant District 75/Citywide Special Education. Staff Development Program (SIG) 1992-93. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE	[93]
NOTE	51p.; For a related document, see EC 302 920. For the 1989-1990 OREA report, see ED 332 476. The evaluation was conducted by the Student Progress Evaluation Unit.
AVAILABLE FROM	Student Progress Unit, 110 Livingston, St., Room 734, Brooklyn NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Anger; Behavior Modification; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentive Grants; Inservice Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Interpersonal Competence; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Professional Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Self Control; *Staff Development; State Aid; Student Responsibility; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The goal of the New York City Board of Education's State Incentive Grant (SIG) program in District 75/Citywide special education was to improve the knowledge levels and competencies of special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related service providers by offering a variety of training options for all eligible personnel serving in District 75 programs. This evaluation of the program focuses on two aspects: Power of Choice (a school-wide responsibility management system to increase students' social skills) and Anger Control (a cognitive behavioral approach to dealing with difficult students). Based on interviews with teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators at four sites where Power of Choice methods were being implemented, evaluators found the program to be successful in achieving its goals. School staff reported the "point" system and the "time out" system to be particularly effective with students. Based on observation of an all-day training session on Anger Control and on follow-up surveys of the participants, evaluators found this component of the program also to be successful. School staff reported particular success with averting potentially problematic situations, and reported that their own behavior had been modified by Anger Control training. Recommendations for program changes conclude the report. Appendixes contain program descriptions and statistical data. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 194

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OREA Report

State Incentive Grant

District 75/Citywide Special Education

Staff Development Program

(SIG)

1992-93

EC 302921

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Tobias
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

State Incentive Grant

District 75/Citywide Special Education

Staff Development Program

(SIG)

1992-93

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Robin Willner
Executive Director

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

8/90

SUMMARY

The goal of the State Incentive Grant (SIG) program in District 75/Citywide special education was to improve the knowledge levels and competencies of special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related service providers (RSPs) by offering a variety of training options for all eligible personnel serving in District 75 programs. SIG provided $1,200,000 during the 1992-93 school year.

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of training in 1992-93 focused on selected aspects of the enrichment program: Power of Choice and Anger Control. The evaluation also included a sampling of workshops at the District 75 annual conference in spring 1993.

Based on interviews with teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators at four sites where Power of Choice methods were being implemented, OREA evaluators found the program to be successful in achieving its goals. School staff reported the "point" system and the "time out" system to be particularly effective with students.

Based on the observation of an all-day training session on Anger Control and on follow-up surveys of the participants, OREA evaluators found this component of the program to be successful. School staff reported particular success with averting potentially problematic situations. They also reported that their own behavior had been modified by Anger Control training.

The District 75 annual conference in spring 1993 attracted a total of 1,982 special educators, an increase of about seven percent over the previous year. In addition, there were 207 parents, an increase of 28 percent over last year.

Based on these findings, OREA concludes that the goal of the District 75 SIG staff development program in 1992-93 was largely achieved. OREA recommends that the program be continued next year with the following specific recommendations offered for each of the behavior improvement programs:

- Continue staff development in behavior management methods in **Power of Choice** schools to insure the program's effectiveness, especially for new staff members.
- Continue on-site follow-up services by POC program consultants in schools that are not fully committed to the POC system of behavior management.

- Continue training for schools that wish to develop POC curriculum materials and need opportunities to refine their behavior management skills.

- Provide adequate space in all participating POC schools to enable the full implementation of the "time out" system.

- Provide advanced training sessions for the POC Responsibility Training Task Force, to strengthen the role and function of task force members at their individual schools, and encourage the exchange of successful POC initiatives.

- Expand the number of schools participating in **Anger Control** training, particularly for staff serving emotionally disturbed students in the various SIE programs.

- Continue the training of teachers, paraprofessionals and RSPs in anger control management, addressing specific problems presented by different student populations and age groups.

- Provide more on-site assistance to staff who need to learn more about implementing anger control interventions, and preventive measures.

- Guide schools in the development of curriculum materials that support their anger control programs.

<u>Annual District 75 Staff Development Conference</u>

- Continue the tradition of the annual District 75 conference, as it provides the only opportunity for all District 75 staff to meet under one roof, sample a variety of professional interests, and interact with parents and outside professionals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, Student Progress Evaluation Unit, under the direction of Henry Solomon. Milton Chaikin served as the project coordinator.

Thanks are due to Arthur Fusco, facilitator of the District 75 SIG program, who cooperated with and was accessible to OREA staff for numerous consultations and the Central Consultation Committee for their wise counsel.

This report could not have been completed without the participation of Abe Strum, David Miller, Millie Berkey, and Renee Schmerler, who were essential to the data collection aspects of the project. We are also thankful to Carol Meyer for her editorial comments and advice.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Dr. Henry Solomon
Student Progress Evaluation Unit
110 Livingston Street - Room 734
Brooklyn, New York 11201.

Contents

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program Background	1
	Program Structure for Current Year	2
	SIG Goals and Options in 1992-93	2
	Evaluation Methodology	3
	Evaluation Questions	4
	Scope of This Report	4
II.	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND FINDINGS	6
	Power of Choice	6
	Anger Control	17
	District 75 Annual Staff Conference	24
III.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
	Conclusions	
	Recommendations	

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Profile of Participating Staff.....	6
Table 2:	Impact of POC Program on Student Behaviors as Reported by Classroom Teachers and Paraprofessionals.....	8
Table 3:	Impact of POC on Students as Reported by School Administrators.....	10
Table 4:	Impact of POC on Staff Behaviors as Reported by Teachers.....	12
Table 5:	Impact of POC on Staff Behaviors as Reported by School Administrators.....	13
Table 6:	Ratings by Participants at Anger Control Conference.....	19
Table 7:	Aspects of Training of Greatest Value to Respondents.....	21
Table 8:	The Use of Anger Management Methods Reported by Respondents.....	23
Table 9:	Participants Attending District 75 Annual Conference.....	25
Table 10:	Combined Ratings Across 10 District 75 Workshops.....	26
Table 11:	Ratings of Workshops by Participants.....	27
Table 12:	Percentage of Respondents Who Indicated That Their Professional Interests Were Met	28
Table 13:	Most Frequent Comments and Suggestions Made by Respondents.....	29

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The State Incentive Grant (SIG) Staff Development project was inaugurated in 1986-87 by the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) as a mandatory five-day staff development program for all eligible special education staff. In 1987-88, each district 75/Citywide school designed its own staff development program to meet the needs of its teachers and paraprofessionals, as indicated in a needs assessment.

The 1988-89 program retained its participant-driven philosophy, and extended the number of opportunities for staff members to participate in activities of professional interest. This format continued in 1989-90 and again in 1990-91. Participants reactions to the enrichment programs* in particular in 1991-92 were overwhelmingly positive, as were their responses to the Fourth Annual District 75 Spring Conference in 1991.

In 1991-92 the program goal of improvement in the knowledge levels and competencies of participating teachers, paraprofessionals, and Related Service Providers (RSPs) was largely achieved. Most participants in school-based training, the enrichment programs, and the annual district spring conference reported that their experiences were instructionally useful and

---

* Enrichment programs include such districtwide options as Non-Aversive Management, Conflict Resolution, and Power of Choice. In 1992-93 Anger Control was introduced as one of the enrichment program options.

appropriate for their classes, and were satisfied that their professional interests were met. In addition, a large percentage of the teachers who had received enrichment program training in 1990-91 reported using some aspect of their training in the classroom during 1991-92.*

PROGRAM STRUCTURE FOR CURRENT YEAR

In 1992-93 a SIG grant in the amount of $1,200,000 enabled District 75 to continue to provide professional development opportunities for eligible special education staff serving students with severe and profound handicapping conditions. One full-time staff development facilitator was responsible for monitoring and coordinating all staff development activities. In addition, this facilitator served as liaison between district and field personnel and worked closely with the Central Consultation Committee (C.C.C.), whose function was to establish operational guidelines, oversee the implementation of the SIG program, and monitor and evaluate the progress of the program. The C.C.C. was composed of members of the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), Council of Supervisors and Administrators (CSA), and representatives of District 75 staff.

SIG GOALS AND OPTIONS IN 1992-93

The stated goal of the SIG program in 1992-93 was to improve the knowledge levels and competencies of special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and RSPs by offering a variety of

---

* For a full description of the program see the 1991-92 OREA Evaluation report.

training options for all eligible personnel serving in District 75 programs. Teachers, RSPs, and UFT paraprofessionals were entitled to a maximum of 25 paid participant hours (hours attended beyond the school day). All IEP-mandated DC 37 paraprofessionals were entitled to a maximum of 20 paid participant hours. Three types of training opportunities were available:

- School-based Options. In accordance with practices established in previous years, each school was allocated a maximum number of per session (presenter) hours from which their plan was funded. Through their Advisory Committees*, schools provided staff development activities, approved by a majority of their SIG eligible staff.

- District-based Option. District 75 offered the choice of five two-hour non-credit-bearing minicourses and up to 25 hours of credit-bearing graduate and undergraduate college courses. All SIG eligible staff were also invited to participate in the annual spring staff development conference.

- Enrichment Programs. The Power of Choice (POC) program was conducted at selected schools by the program consultant, and training in a new program called Anger Control was initiated at a small number of schools serving SIE VII students. A brief summary of these programs is provided in Appendix A.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of the SIG training program in 1992-93 focused on three components: two enrichment programs (Power of Choice and Anger Control) and the annual citywide conference. Specifically, the evaluation included:

---

* Each school established an Advisory Committee consisting of staff drawn from all program service categories. Members include: the principal, UFT chapter leader, one teacher, one paraprofessional, one RSP. In addition, one member of this committee is assigned as the official liaison to the Central Advisory Committee.

- interviews with teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators at four sites where POC methods were being used by staff who had been involved in POC from one-five years;

- a focus meeting of the POC task force members representing staff from eight schools involved in this program;

- observation of one full-day Anger Control workshop, and a survey of participating teachers and paraprofessionals from two schools and their respective satellites;

- a follow-up survey of Anger Control participants after hey had an opportunity to implement the training in their classrooms; and

- a survey of participants from 10 selected workshops, conducted at the District 75 annual spring conference.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The 1992-93 evaluation was designed to provide answers to the following questions:

- What impact has the POC program had on students and staff in four schools where this program has been implemented schoolwide for a period of from one-three years?

- What is the role of the POC Responsibility Training Task Force, and how effectively have their schools implemented turnkey training in POC methods?

- How effective was the training in Anger Control as perceived by the participants? To what extent did these participants apply the Anger Control techniques? Did their participation result in changes in student behaviors?

- How effective was the workshop sample at the Citywide Annual Spring Conference, as perceived by the participants?

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

Chapter II of this report presents the findings obtained from the interviews and surveys of special education staff participating in and/or knowledgeable about the SIG training and implementation. Chapter III draws conclusions about the

effectiveness of SIG in 1992-93, and offers specific recommendations for 1993-94.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND FINDINGS

POWER OF CHOICE

Interviews With Participating Staff

OREA selected four out of eight schools where Power of Choice (POC) had been adopted schoolwide and where the staff had participated for one or more years in SIG staff development activities. Two teachers, two paraprofessionals, and an administrator were interviewed at each of the four POC sites. These constitute a sample of the staff using POC at these schools. Table 1 shows that all teachers and paraprofessionals interviewed received some training in POC methods. With one exception (school B) the principals interviewed said that all teachers at their schools were using POC with their students.

Table 1

Profile of Sample Staff

School	Position	Mean Years in School	Mean Years of POC Trng[a]
A	Teachers (2)	4.0	1.5
	Paraprofessionals (2)	2.5	1.5
B	Teachers (2)	4.5	1.0
	Paraprofessionals (2)	6.0	1.0
C	Teachers (2)	1.5	1.0
	Paraprofessionals (2)	3.5	2.0
D	Teachers (2)	1.0	3.0
	Paraprofessionals (2)	5.0	2.5

[a] Includes on-site training in 1992-93.

Impact of POC on Students

The staff members interviewed were asked to make judgements about the perceived impact of POC training on their students.

Ratings by teachers and paraprofessionals. To determine the impact of POC on students, teachers and paraprofessionals were asked to rate their classes on a variety of student behavior variables. A rating scale from 1 to 5 was used, with 5 representing "much improved" and 1 representing "much worse". The overall mean score was 4.3 for teachers and 4.6 for paraprofessionals, indicating a positive impact on students. Mean rating scores for each variable are summarized in Table 2.

Aspects of POC that had greatest impact on students. In identifying the aspects of POC that had the greatest impact on students, the "point" and "time out" systems* were mentioned most frequently by teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators. Their observations can be summed up as follows:

- The "point" system creates a motivational structure that helped staff develop a quality of discipline that is more intrinsic than before POC was introduced. Students are now making choices and accepting responsibility for their actions.
- The "time out" system encourages students to be more open with their teachers. It is effective when used judiciously and appropriately. The system engages students to reflect on what they did wrong and what they can do to change their behavior. The overall impact of the "time out" intervention was very significant in those schools with appropriate space for this activity.

---

* In the "point system" students receive tangible rewards and priviledges for positive behavior. In the "time out system" inappropriate behaviors are discouraged and students reflect on positive alternative behaviors in the "time out" room after removal from the classroom.

Table 2
Impact of POC Program on Student Behaviors as Reported by Classroom Teachers and Paraprofessionals

Behavior Variables	Mean Scores[a] Teachers (N=8)	Paras (N=8)
Attendance	4.0	---[b]
Classroom behavior	4.0	4.8
Out of classroom behavior	4.4	4.3
Impulse control	3.9	4.6
Work habits	4.1	4.6
Follows rules and regulations	4.3	4.1
Relationships with peers	4.3	4.1
Takes responsibility for own behavior	4.3	4.4
Accepts criticism	3.6	3.7
Stays on task	4.3	4.1
Social skills	4.0	4.0
Respect for authority	4.1	4.3
Resolves conflicts	4.2	4.4
Completes assignments	3.9	---[b]
Listening skills	4.1	4.0
Motivated to earn points	4.4	5.0
Enjoys school	4.1	4.5
Self esteem	4.5	4.5
Overall grades	3.7	---[b]
Overall mean	4.3	4.6

[a] Scores were rated on a 5 point scale with 1= much worse and 5= much improved.

[b] These variables were not included in the paraprofessional interviews.

- No class received <u>less</u> than a rating of 3.6 in every variable, and the ratings were relatively consistent across variables.

<u>Ratings by administrators</u>. For the most part, the results of interviews with administrators supported the above findings at each school (see Table 3). In most instances, the administrators' assessments were in accord with teachers and paraprofessionals on some measures (e.g., classroom behavior and respect for authority), but in a few cases they were less certain about the impact of POC (e.g., on attendance and academic

achievement). Perhaps some of the disparities can be explained by the fact that the administrators' responses included their knowledge of other teachers and paraprofessionals using POC in their respective schools who were not part of the interview group. Some of the teachers and paraprofessionals in these classes may have reported less success with the implementation of POC than did the interview sample.

TABLE 3

Impact of POC on Students as Reported by School Administrators (N=4)

School	Classroom Behavior	Out of Classroom Behavior	Respect for Authority	Conflict Resolution	Attendance	Disruptive Behavior
A	• Fewer behavior problems, referrals & suspensions	• Improved, but not as good as in classrooms	• Increased	• Helped staff to control conflict situations	• Has improved somewhat	• Much less
B	• Wonderful improvements	• Improved, especially in hallways	• Improved	• Helped in resolution of conflicts	• No change	• Incidence way down
C	• Fewer behavior problems; improvement in self-esteem	• Fewer students in hallways	• More respect for teachers	• Goals set to actively resolve conflicts	• Essentially the same	• Less
D	• Fewer fights & suspensions	No change	• Greatly improved	• Much better resolution of conflicts	• Slight improvement	• Much less

• Administrators reported that negative behaviors, particularly disruptive incidents, declined significantly in and out of the classroom.

Impact of POC on Staff/School

According to the teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators interviewed, the POC program also had a positive impact on staff and on the school as a whole. Teachers and paraprofessionals noted the effects of POC by awarding high ratings on a number of behavior variables (see table 4). Administrators also reported on the positive effects on staff behavior (see table 5). The effects are best summarized by the following comments made by teachers, paras, and administrators at the interviews:

- Teachers sent fewer children to restrictive environments.
- Improved planning resulted in fewer conflict situations.
- Staff morale improved.
- There was a more interdisciplinary approach to teaching.
- Less time was devoted to discipline and more time to teaching.
- Staff had a better attitude with "difficult" students.

Table 4

Impact of Power of Choice on Staff Behaviors as Reported by Teachers and Paraprofessionals

Behavior Variables	Mean Ratings[a] Teachers (N=8)	Paras (N=8)
Instructional methods	4.5	4.4
Classroom management	4.8	4.5
Communicating with students	4.6	3.9
Implementing Power of Choice methods	4.0	4.5
Dealing with individual student problems	4.3	4.5
Enjoys school	3.9	4.3
Understands students' needs	4.3	4.6
Overall mean	4.3	4.4

[a] Respondents used a 5 point Likert scale with 1=much worse and 5=much improved.

- According to teachers the greatest impact of POC was on classroom management, and paraprofessionals reported that the greatest imapct of POC was on understanding students' needs.

Table 5

Impact of POC on Staff Behaviors as Reported by School Administrators (N=4)

School	
	Managing Classroom Behavior
A	• Fewer children sent to restrictive environment.
B	• Point system has improved classroom management. classroom management.
C	• POC methods have improved management of problem
D	• Student decision-making has improved classroom management.
	Resolving conflicts
A	• Better planning improved conflict situations.
B	• POC helped in resolution of conflicts.
C	• Goals set to actively resolve conflicts.
D	• POC structure enhances peaceful resolution of conflicts.
	Communicating With Students
A	• Conveys attitude that they believe in students.
B	• Communicates message about student responsibilities.
C	• Communication with students facilitates better dialogue.
D	• More open communication has reduced student resistance to authority.
	Staff Morale
A	• Has definitely improved.
B	• More consistency has led to better staff morale.
C	• Staff morale improved; staff more effective.
D	• Staff functions as a "family".
	Teaching Methods
A	• POC methods provide more structure for implementing behavioral objectives.
B	• POC used as lesson motivation.
C	• Changes in methodology hard to discern.
D	• Teachers getting away from lecture mode; more interactive learning.
	Achievement of Instructional Goals
A	• Better reading and math test scores.
B	• Improvement in interpersonal relations.
C	• Difficult to see any changes.
D	• Difficult to measure changes.

• With few exceptions, the impact of Power of Choice on all staff behaviors was high.

Responsibility Training Task Force

In 1992-93 SIG funded the establishment of a Responsibility Training Task Force. Each of the eight participating POC schools designated four staff members to be responsible for organizing and conducting turnkey POC training for new and inexperienced teachers and paraprofessionals, and providing ongoing training and resource material for schoolwide implementation of the POC program. Each school-level task force included a teacher, paraprofessional, RSP, and administrator. The training was set up so that the task force members would participate in a series of workshops conducted by a POC consultant, and then return to their schools to pass along the information they had received and/or conduct training sessions in the use of POC. The POC consultant also provided on-site assistance to the various task force members in implementing the turnkey training.

The OREA evaluator observed one of the ten training sessions provided to task force members, and conducted a focus group with the 16 task force members present. In addition, he asked the task force members to complete a survey at the end of the session, and interviewed the principals of four POC schools about the turnkey training.

The discussion and surveys revealed that some of the task force members viewed their role primarily as a disseminator of information, while others saw their role as trainer or resource person. Most also felt that their job was to stimulate and

encourage greater involvement of school staff in the Power of Choice program.

Accomplishments included the following:

- most task force members organized and conducted training sessions with staff during lunch periods, one school provided after-school and Saturday turn-key training, and another conducted half-day training sessions for teachers and paraprofessionals;
- one school organized committees to develop standards and guidelines for the "point" system, and task force members at other schools reorganized the POC program by making the "point" system more relevant;
- some schools developed handbooks for students, staff, and parents for POC; and
- task force members obtained funds for a school store.

In general, the level of implementation difficulties varied with the length of time the participating schools had been involved in the POC training and implementation process (from one to three years). Schools new to POC tended to report start-up problems such as scheduling common prep time for staff meetings, obtaining appropriate instructional materials, and having a designated "time out" room for students.

The major issues raised by many of the focus group participants about the implementation of POC suggested a need to improve or increase the:

- receptivity of staff to new ideas and methods in behavior management;
- level of commitment by the entire faculty to the POC program;
- provision of adequate space to implement the "time out" system;
- understanding of the dynamics of the severely emotionally

disturbed child by all staff;

- integration of POC concepts and methods into the overall instructional program; and
- practice in using POC as a method to "control" students' behavior.

Overall, the results thus far suggest that the task force has made a good beginning in building a cadre of professionals with the knowledge and skills needed to organize the training and assist with the implementation of POC at their individual schools. The monthly meetings with the program consultant have helped them to better understand the importance for children to have choices that make it possible for them improve their lives.

The findings indicate a strong inclination by the participants and the school administrators to continue the Responsibility Training Task Force. To correct some of the shortcomings in the implementation of POC, the participants recommended:

- continuous staff development to insure the program's effectiveness - especially for new staff members;
- increasing the scope of the program by involving more staff members at meetings, focusing on causes of student misbehavior, and learning how to apply the principles of POC to younger age groups;
- a proposal for two-day meetings of the task force;
- curriculum-centered POC materials;
- more hands-on activities; and
- raising funds for trips, parties, and a school store to motivate positive student behaviors.

ANGER CONTROL

Two all-day workshops in Anger Control were held in April and May for the staffs of two participating schools in District 75. One workshop was observed by an OREA evaluator, who also surveyed the teachers, paraprofessionals, and support staff about the effectiveness of the training. In addition, evaluators administered follow-up surveys to Anger Control participants from both workshops done in May and June, respectively, to determine what aspects of the training were being implemented.

Observations of Anger Control Workshop

Fifty-seven teachers, paraprofessionals, and support staff who were serving elementary and secondary SIE VII students were observed at an all-day workshop on anger management strategies. The purpose of the training was to introduce the participants to an alternative approach to controlling students' anger and aggression, and to suggest preventive strategies as an alternative to traditional methods of behavior modification.

The focus of the morning session was provided by the keynote speaker, Dr. Edith Feindler. She described the physiological, cognitive, and behavioral aspects of anger and its expression, and suggested ways to channel childrens' anger by empowering them to make acceptable choices. Two separate workshops in the afternoon addressed the different needs of students at the elementary and adolescent levels. The OREA evaluator noted that participants were keenly interested in the anger control approach and enthusiastic about "buying into" the program outlined by the

conference leaders. A summary of the evaluator's observations appears in Appendix B.

Survey of Anger Control Workshop Participants

All participants (N=57) responded to the survey of the all-day Anger Control workshop observed by the OREA evaluator. The data from this survey indicate that participants in both the morning and afternoon workshops were very satisfied with the presentations. Most respondents reported that the training was well organized, and that the content of the training was very useful to their daily activities. Comments by participants at the morning lecture were especially complimentary about the keynote speaker. The only negative reaction was from a supervisor who questioned the appropriateness of anger control methods for the SIE VII student population. This was not an issue, however, for the teachers and paraprofessionals. The overall mean ratings of the entire conference were high (5 and above on a 6-point Likert scale). These are summarized in Table 6. For a more detailed breakdown of the ratings for each variable, see Appendix B.

Without exception, all the respondents indicated that the Anger Control conference met their professional interests, and except for two of the participating supervisors in the P.M. adolescent workshop, a large majority of the respondents reported a significant increase in knowledge as a result of the conference. More specific data about the reported increases in knowledge for the A.M. and P.M. segments of the conference are to be found in Appendix B.

Table 6

Ratings by Participants at Anger Control Conference[a]

Position	Mean Scores A.M. Lecture	El W.S.	Sec W.S.
Teachers	5.4	5.6	4.9
Paraprofessionals	5.4	5.5	5.1
Supervisors	5.6	---	4.3
RSPs	5.0	5.6	---
Parents	5.6	---	---
Overall Mean	5.4	5.5	5.0

[a] On a six point Likert scale from negative (1) to positive (6).

Follow-up Survey of Implementation of Training

There were 57 participants in the workshop observed by the OREA evaluator and 65 participants in the workshop that was not observed. To determine the aspects of the Anger Control training that were being implemented by the workshop participants, questionnaires were sent to all of these participants within two months of the training. Only 30 percent of the participants responded to the follow-up surveys.

Value of training. Respondents were asked to indicate the aspects of the training that were of greatest value to them. The aspects mentioned most frequently in the survey were:

- the realistic and moving presentation by the trainer, Dr. Feindler;
- the presentation of anger control methods/strategies/ approaches used in different classroom situations; and
- anger control as a preventive strategy: recognizing a potential problem and intervening before it erupts.

- anger control as a preventive strategy: recognizing a potential problem and intervening before it erupts.

The combined responses from teachers, paras, and RSPs to the question on aspects of greatest value appear in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Aspects of Training of Greatest Value to Respondents
(N=33)

Aspects of Training	# Respondents	% Respondents
Opening presentation by Dr. Feindler	9	27%
Anger control methods/approaches in classroom situations	7	21
How to deal with different levels of anger without losing feelings of adequacy	3	09
Anger control as a preventive strategy: intervening before problem erupts	3	09
Stepping back from student/leaving space between student and teacher	2	06
Understanding the aggressive child	2	06
Controlling/internalizing anger directed at students	1	03
Assertiveness training	1	03
Recognizing feelings and attitudes of students	1	03
Exercising patience with difficult children	1	03
Dealing with angry family members	1	03
Other	2	06

- The aspect of greatest value to a number of conference participants was the performance by Dr. Feindler.

Anger management methods used. Respondents were asked to indicate the anger management methods they were using as a result of the training, and the effects it had on their students' behavior. The methods most frequently mentioned were:

- stepping back, making eye contact, and thinking before responding;
- prevention approaches such as detecting the entry of angry students, intervening before a bad situation escalates, and speaking in a low (unthreatening) tone; and
- using cognitive reminders to discourage crisis situations (e.g., talking out a problem, repeating a phrase firmly).

Few respondents were very specific about the effects of anger management methods on their students. This should not be surprising given the relatively short time lapse between the workshops and the distribution of the follow-up surveys. Those who noted cause and effect said that the anger control methods helped to calm some students and prevented the escalation of negative behavior. The combined responses by teachers, paraprofessionals, and RSPs to the question on implementation of training appear in Table 8.

Table 8

The Use of Anger Management Methods Reported by Respondents (N=32)

Anger Management Methods	# Respondents	% Respondents
Stepping back/making eye contact/ thinking before responding with anger	13	41%
Prevention methods: detecting entering angry students; intervening before situation escalates	6	19
Cognitive reminders to discourage crisis situations: talking out problem/reasoning/ repeating phrase firmly	5	16
Behavior modification	4	13
Releasing anger through classroom exercises (e.g., deep breathing)	2	06
Obtaining students' trust and respect	2	06

Effects of anger management training on staff behavior.

Eighty-nine percent of the 37 respondents who addressed this question said that their own classroom behavior had been affected significantly as a result of the anger management training. Of these, the most frequently mentioned behaviors were:

- a greater awareness of anger signals from students;
- reacting more positively to student misbehavior;
- reflecting on options when confronting angry students; and
- listening to all sides before responding.

Need for additional training. Eighty-one percent (N=30) of the respondents said they needed additional training in anger management to help them with its implementation. Of these, nine indicated additional training was needed to address problems

presented by different student populations and age groups. Another eight felt a need to learn more about anger control interventions such as specific reaction strategies and preventive measures. A few respondents asked for curriclum materials on anger control and more help in dealing with crisis situations. Of the 10 respondents requesting additional (but unspecified) training, six suggested that it would enhance the implementation process.

DISTRICT 75 ANNUAL STAFF CONFERENCE

Participants' Assessment of the District 75 Conference

The Sixth Annual SIG Staff Development Conference was a collaborative venture of the District 75/Citywide Programs, the UFT, and the Parent Action Committee. Teachers, paraprofessionals, RSPs, and parents were offered a menu of workshops from which to select topics of interest.

Program Participants

According to the information obtained from the District 75 SIG Conference Informal Evaluation Report (March 1993), the Annual Staff Conference at the Jacob K. Javits Convention Center attracted a total of 1,982 special educators and 207 parents. (see Table 9).

Table 9

Participants Attending District 75 Annual Conference[a]

District 75		Non-District 75	
Position	Number	Position	Number
Teachers	799	Teachers	150
Paraprofessionals	839	Paraprofessionals	54
Related Service Providers	80	Related Service Providers	7
Administrators/others	43	Administrators/others	10
		Parents	207
Total	1,761		428

[a] Information obtained from District 75 Conference Report, March 1993.

The 1,761 District 75 people who participated this year represent a seven percent increase over last year. The largest increases were registered by teachers and paraprofessionals. Parent participation also increased this year by 28 percent.

In all, a total of 395 participants attending a sample of 10 workshops were surveyed by OREA. They were asked to rate the quality of the workshops on five dimensions of effectiveness, using a six-point Likert scale with 1=negative and 6=positive. The combined mean ratings of the workshops on each of these dimensions appear in Table 10, and the mean ratings for the individual workshops are enumerated in Table 11.

Table 10

Combined Ratings Across 10 District 75 Workshops

Dimension	Mean Ratings
Organization of training sessions	5.3
Usefulness of content of sessions to daily activities	5.3
Opportunities to ask questions/present ideas	5.2
Helpfulness of materials used in presentations	5.2
Enough time to cover fully training topics	4.7
Combined Mean Rating	5.1

- The 10 surveyed workshops received high mean ratings on all five dimensions.

Table 11

Ratings of Workshops by Participants[a]
(N=395)

Workshop	# Respondents	Mean Ratings
How to Deal With Verbal Abuse	81	5.5
Self Advocacy: How it Works	16	5.5
Teaching Academics Through Home Economics	13	5.4
Wynroth Math Program	19	5.1
Science in the Classroom	25	5.1
Importance of the Paraprofessional	85	5.1
Integrating Related Service Goals for SIE I students	8	5.0
Behavior Modification: Implementing a Reward System	57	4.9
Adolescent Anger Control	52	4.9
Sexuality Issues for Students with Developmental Disabilities	39	4.5
Combined mean rating		5.1

[a] On a six-point Likert scale from negative (1) to positive (6).

- Sixty percent of the workshops surveyed produced ratings of five or more, indicating a high level of overall participant satisfaction.

Overall, the professional interests of the respondents were satisfied by the workshops they had chosen. Table 12 presents a summary of the affirmative responses, by position, for each workshop.

Table 12

Percentage of Respondents Who Indicated That Their Professional Interests Were Met

Workshop	Tchrs	Paras	Admin	RSPs	Parents
Self Advocacy: How it Works	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Adolescent Anger Control	100	100	100	67	100
Teaching Academics Through Home Economics	100	100	100	--	--
How to Deal with Verbal Abuse	100	100	--	100	--
Integrating Related Service Goals for SIE I Students	--	100	--	100	100
Wynroth Math Program	100	100	--	--	--
Importance of the Para	100	95	--	--	--
Science in the Classroom	91	100	--	--	--
Behavior Modification	87	95	--	100	100
Sexuality Issues	77	94	--	--	--

A relatively small number of participants responded to the open-ended "Comments and Suggestions" question. The comments of respondents that appeared most frequently are summarized in table 13, by workshop.

Table 13

Most Frequent Comments and Suggestions Made by Respondents

Workshop	Comments and Suggestions	Number
Self Advocacy: How it Works	• Good/excellent presentation	2
	• Useful/informative	2
Adolescent Anger Control	• Good/excellent workshop	7
	• Good/excellent presentation	4
	• Useful/informative	3
Teaching Academics Through Home Eco.	• Presenter knowledgeable	3
	• Useful/informative	2
How to Deal with Verbal Abuse	• Good/excellent workshop	22
	• Useful/informative	8
	• Good/excellent presentation	3
Integrating Related Service Goals	• Need more time	2
Wynroth Math Program	• Good/excellent workshop	3
	• Useful/informative	3
	• Need more time	2
Importance of the Para	• Good/excellent workshop	18
	• Useful/informative	9
	• Need more training	11
	• More opportunity to ask questions	8
Science in Classroom	• Hands-on activities good	6
	• Need more time	2
Behavior Modification	• Good/excellent presentation	3
Sexuality Issues	• Good/excellent workshop	2
	• Useful/informative	2
	• Interesting	2
	• Provide more examples	3

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The goal of the District 75 SIG staff development program-to improve the knowledge levels and competencies of special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related service providers by providing a variety of training options---was largely achieved.

Overall, the staff development activities in District 75 in 1992-93 were effectively managed by the SIG facilitator who, in consultation with the C.C.C., provided ongoing technical assistance and support to the participating schools. While serving as the liaison between the C.C.C. and field personnel, the SIG facilitator provided strong and effective leadership throughout the life of the project.

According to teachers and paraprofessionals who were implementing P.O.C. methods, students' classroom and out-of-classroom behavior had improved significantly. Administrators also credited POC for its impact on staff, noting improvements in instructional methods, classroom management, and communication with students. The schoolwide impact of P.O.C. included increased cooperation among staff, a more pleasant teaching and learning environment, and less time devoted to discipline.

The Responsibility Training Task Force, established this year to guide the training and implementation of POC in their respective schools, made a good beginning. Though some members reported implementation difficulties--such as the lack of space

for a "time out" system--a survey of administrators at these schools concluded that the task force members had greatly enhanced the effectiveness of POC.

The Anger Control workshop observed by an OREA evaluator was very impressive, and the participants surveyed were enthusiastic about "buying into" the program. A large majority of the teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff surveyed reported that the training was well organized, that the content was very useful to their daily activities, and that a significant increase in knowledge about anger control methods resulted from this experience. A follow-up survey of Anger Control participants indicated that most were implementing approaches to prevent escalation of negative behavior using methods they had learned in the workshops when responding to difficult SIE VII students.

The Sixth Annual State Incentive Grant Staff Development Conference in Spring 1993 was very successful, offering workshops that appealed to a wide segment of professionals and parents. The 1,761 District 75 participants represented a seven percent increase over the number who attended last year. The 10 workshops evaluated by OREA all received high ratings on five dimensions of quality by participants.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions in this report indicate that SIG staff development be continued next year with the following specific recommendations offered for each of the program components:

Power of Choice

- Continue staff development in behavior management methods in POC schools to insure the program's effectiveness, especially for new staff members.
- Continue on-site follow-up services by POC program consultants in schools that are not fully committed to the POC system of behavior management.
- Continue training for schools that wish to develop POC curriculum materials and need opportunities to refine their behavior management skills.
- Provide adequate space in all participating POC schools to enable the full implementation of the "time out" system.
- Provide advanced training sessions for the POC Responsibility Training Task Force, to strengthen the role and function of task force members at their individual schools, and encourage the exchange of successful POC initiatives.

Anger Control

- Expand the number of schools participating in Anger Control training, particularly for staff serving emotionally disturbed students in the various SIE programs.
- Continue the training of teachers, paraprofessionals and RSPs in anger control management, addressing specific problems presented by different student populations and age groups.
- Provide more on-site assistance to staff who need to learn more about implementing anger control interventions, and preventive measures.
- Guide schools in the development of curriculum materials that support their anger control programs.

Annual District 75 Staff Development Conference

- Continue the tradition of the annual District 75 conference as it provides the only opportunity for all District 75 staff to meet under one roof, sample a variety of professional interests and interact with parents and outside professionals.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Power of Choice: This program is a school-wide responsibility management system to increase students' social skills based on William Glasser's "Reality Therapy" as described in his book Control Theory in the Classroom. The training is conducted by Mr. Doug Naylor of the Educator Training Center.

Anger Management: This program encompasses a comprehensive cognitive behavioral approach to dealing with difficult SIE VII students. It includes therapeutic interventions, self management principles, relaxation, assertiveness and contracting techniques, self-instructional training, and self-evaluation. The training is conducted by Dr. Eva Feindler of the Department of Psychology at L.I.U./C.W.Post Campus.

APPENDIX B

ANGER CONTROL CONFERENCE

1. SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS

2. SURVEY TABLES

Anger Control Workshop
Summary of OREA Observations
Conference Participants: 57

Training Focus	Description of Training Activity	Leader's Presentation	Participants' Responses/Concerns
· Strategies to develop anger control for adolescent "at risk" students. · Strategies to develop anger control for elementary school "at risk" students.	· Keynote speaker described physiological, cognitive and behavioral aspects of anger and its expression. · Keynote speaker emphasized that children must be empowered to make acceptable choices. · Leader suggested strategies that related to participants' school experiences. · Leader related strategies to her theories of causation of anger among secondary school students. · Discussions were tailored to participants' personal experiences.	· Presentation by keynote speaker was very relevant to the SIE VII population and related to needs and interests of participants. · Leaders of both workshop groups were extremely charismatic and related exceptionally well to participants. · Pathology background of students was addressed extremely well by workshop leaders. · Leaders responded immediately and in meaningful ways to questions from participants.	· Participants were interested and extremely responsive during the brief discussion periods. · Participants appeared to enthusiastically "buy into" the program described by the presenter. · Participants took copious notes and raised many questions. · Participants appeared eager to attend future sessions of Anger Control.

Table A

Ratings of Anger Control Participants at A.M. Lecture[a]

Variables	Mean Scores Tchrs (N=4)	Paras (N=2)	Admin (N=2)	RSPs (N=2)	Other (N=1)
Adequacy of time	5.3	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0
Organization of training	5.6	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0
Helpfulness of materials	5.5	6.0	5.5	4.5	5.0
Opportunities to ask questions	4.8	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.0
Usefulness of content	5.8	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0
Extent of knowledge before session	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0
Extent of knowledge after session	5.3	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall mean	5.3	5.5	5.4	4.9	5.3

[a] On a six-point Likert scale from negative (1) to positive (6).

Table B

Ratings by Participants of Elementary Level Anger Control Workshop[a]

Variables	Mean Scores Teachers (N=6)	Paras (N=8)	RSPs (N=3)
Adequacy of time	5.2	5.4	5.3
Organization of training	6.0	5.8	5.7
Helpfulness of materials	5.3	5.3	5.7
Opportunities to ask questions	5.8	5.9	5.7
Usefulness of content	5.8	5.9	5.7
Extent of knowledge before workshop	4.4	3.1	3.7
Extent of knmowledge after workshop	5.2	5.4	5.0

[a] On a Six point Likert scale from negative (1) to positive (6).

Table C

Ratings by Participants of P.M. Secondary Level Anger Control Workshop[a]

Variables	Mean Scores Teachers (N=14)	Paras (N=13)	Supervisors (N=2)
Adequacy of time	5.0	5.2	3.5
Organization of training	5.7	5.8	5.5
Helpfulness of materials	5.0	5.1	4.5
Opportunities to ask questions	4.3	4.8	4.5
Usefulness of content	5.1	5.2	3.5
Extent of knowledge before workshop	4.3	4.3	5.5
Extent of knowledge after workshop	4.9	5.2	3.0

[a] On a six-point Likert scale from negative (1) to positive (6).